**National Institute of Corrections
Prison Classification Peer Training and Strategy Session:
What's Happening with Prison Classification Systems?
September 6 - 7, 2000 Proceedings**

February 15, 2001

By:

Patricia L. Hardyman, Ph.D.
Terri Adams-Fuller, M.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.   INTRODUCTION

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) has provided for many state and local correctional agencies to receive short- and/or long-term technical assistance to address classification and information system-related problems. NIC also continually provides training for correctional administrators and line staff at its training academy in Longmont, Colorado. However, correctional administrators rarely have the opportunity to participate in a national forum to share their classification-related developments and strategies, ask questions, and discuss problems with their peers. To address this need, The Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections (ICJC) in conjunction with NIC, organized a two-day national forum for practitioners. The forum provided the participants with an opportunity to:

- Build their classification-related skills and broaden their understanding of new developments in the field;

- Share recent accomplishments and strategies for addressing current classification trends and issues; and

- Provide feedback to NIC and technical assistance providers on how to maximize the utility and effectiveness of their services.

As a joint initiative between NIC and ICJC, NIC provided for the participants' transportation and accommodations while The Institute, in consultation with NIC, developed the forum's curriculum, prepared the session materials, and produced a written transcript of these proceedings. A registration fee was not charged to the participants and since the forum was located in Washington, D.C. research staff from the Federal Bureau of Prisons and NIC were also able to attend. Selection of the participants was based on several criteria which included:

- Experience with innovative and/or comprehensive classification systems;

- Extensive knowledge of a specialized aspect of classification; or

- Size and geographic location of the agency.

The intent was to identify a diverse group of agencies that was actively engaged with state-of-the-art classification systems. The size and geographic location of the agencies were important to ensure that the proceedings would be universally relevant and would illustrate the potential developments across all types of agencies, not just the large agencies or those with extensive resources for research and information systems. The participants represented the state correctional agencies of New Jersey, Washington, South Dakota, Florida, Montana, South Carolina, Wisconsin, Michigan, Colorado, and Pennsylvania.

The forum was also envisioned as an opportunity for NIC and The Institute to learn from agency practitioners about their classification-related work, ideas, and questions. In recognition of the significant expertise of the state correctional practitioners, the participants served as the primary presenters, with NIC and Institute staff acting as moderators. This format also served NIC's goal of providing opportunities for networking and information-sharing among the agencies.

The forum's agenda, names, and affiliation of the participants are provided in Figure 1. As indicated by the agenda, a wide range of topics were discussed, including comprehensive classification systems, linkage between information systems and classification, internal classification systems, classification of high-risk and women offenders, classification-related ligation, and the linkage between prison classification systems and community re-entry planning. A summary of each presentation is provided in Section II, followed by a description of the current and future NIC classification-related initiatives in Section III. Appendix A includes biographical and contact information for all participants.

Figure 1: Peer Training Agenda
National Institute of Corrections
Prison Classification Peer Training and Strategy Session:
What's Happening with Prison Classification Systems?

Wednesday, September 6, 2000

Time	Topic	Discussant
9:00 - 9:30	Welcome	Sammie Brown, NIC
	Introductions	Larry Solomon, NIC
	NIC Goals and Objectives	
	Logistics	
9:30 - 10:30	Comprehensive Classification: Creating a Seamless System	James Austin, ICJC
	• PA: Linking All the Pieces	William Harrison, PA DOC
10:30 - 10:45	Break	All
11:00 - 12:00	Management Information System	Sammie Brown, NIC
	• Classification Data for Planning	Meesim Lee, SC DOC
	• Linking DOC to the Jails	Stan Repko, NJ DOC
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch	All
1:00 - 3:00	Prison Internal Classification Systems	Patricia Hardyman, ICJC
	• Automated Risk and Needs	Fred Roesel, FL DOC
	• AICS: Personality Based Model	Ed Lightenburg, SD DOC
3:00 - 3:15	Break	All
3:15 - 5:00	Classification for High Risk Offenders	James Austin, ICJC
	• Managing High Risk Offenders	Pam Brandon, WI DOC

Figure 1: Peer Training Agenda
National Institute of Corrections
Prison Classification Peer Training and Strategy Session:
What's Happening with Prison Classification Systems?

Thursday, September 7, 2000

Time	Topic	Discussant
9:00 - 9:15	Good Morning Logistics	Patricia Hardyman, ICJC
9:15 - 10:30	Responding to Litigation: • Winning Classification Systems Michigan and Montana	James Austin, ICJC Nick Ludwick, MI DOC Candyce Neubauer, MTDOC
10:30 - 10:45	Break	All
10:45 - 12:00	Classification of Women Offenders • NIC's Work with 7 states • BOP's Work with Revalidation & Classification of Women Offenders • A Dynamic Instrument for Women	Patricia Hardyman, ICJC Miles Harer, BOP Scott Hromas, CO DOC
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch	All
1:00 - 3:00	Re-entry - Linking Prison Classification to Re-entry to the Community • Incarceration Planning	James Austin, ICJC James Thatcher, WA DOC
3:00 - 3:15	Break	All
3:15 - 4:30	The NIC Technical Assistance Process • Dos and Don'ts: Feedback for Providers • Participation in TA and Training Initiatives	James Austin, ICJC
4:30 - 5:00	Wrap up - Next Steps	Sammie Brown, NIC

II.   SESSION PROCEEDINGS

1.   Linking All the Pieces

Discussant: William Harrison, Director of Inmate Services
Pennsylvania Department of Corrections

The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (PA DOC) has developed the "Pennsylvania Additive Classification Tool" (PACT). PACT is a fully-automated classification system that is reliable, easy to administer, and incorporates all relevant data to establish an inmate's custody level, housing unit assignment, work detail, treatment, and programming needs. The system sorts inmates, channels resources to inmates according to their risk and needs, rewards positive behavior, and enables both inmates and staff to fully understand the factors on which a specific classification decision is based. It is based upon the *"just desserts"* model in which an inmate's classification level is based on his/her commitment crime and institutional behavior.

PACT is the product of a multi-disciplinary committee composed of 20 to 25 supervisory and line staff representing institutional, central office, and treatment staff as well as representatives from the local correctional officers' unions. The success of this collaborative effort is attributed to its multi-disciplinary approach, endorsement by agency heads, and comprehensive training.

PACT is very beneficial to the inmate classification process because it reduces duplicate manual entry of case information, allows all staff to view the inmate's current profile, and provides easy access to information required for efficient and effective management of the facility. These benefits are realized primarily because PACT links the critical information systems of the department, i.e., inmate records, bed management, inter-facility transfers, transportation, inmate information and compensation, visitor tracking, and mental health tracking. PACT also informs system-level planning for the placement of programs across and within facilities and on-going assessment of departmental policies and procedures via its regular management reports, e.g. misconduct tracking system, monthly override summary, and monthly custody level breakdown.

Future classification-related activities anticipated by the PA DOC include adjusting the offense gravity scores, updating the institutional disciplinary policy, revisiting the need for a separate instrument for female inmates, and working with an outside consultant to revalidate the current external classification system.

2.   External and Internal Classification

Discussant: James Austin, Ph.D., Co-Director
Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections

To have a constructive dialog on classification issues, it is useful to review the key components of the classification process and agree on the operational definition of common criminal justice-related terms that often differ across jurisdictions. Comprehensive classification includes of the following major components:
- External classification

- Internal classification

- Needs assessment

- Community risk assessment

All of these systems rely upon objective factors that have been tested on the agency's inmate population to ensure the systems are both reliable and valid. The objective factors are selected for their ability to estimate the inmate's risks to staff and other inmates; treatment and special program needs; as well as departmental policy.

External classification is designed to determine an inmate's custody level, which in turn, will influence the facility at which the inmate will be housed. It uses both risk and policy factors to make such a determination. The risk component of the external classification system focuses on the inmate's offense, prior criminal record, institutional conduct (both prior and current), and socio-demographic factors, all of which have been tested to show a statistical association with prison conduct. Policy factors are not necessarily predictive of actual risk, but do reflect the "risk" to the correctional agency if certain types of inmates are housed in lower custody levels.

The external classification process includes an initial and reclassification phase. The initial classification relies on factors found to be <u>predictive</u> of institutional conduct, while the reclassification phase (which occurs every 6 to 12 months thereafter) places greater emphasis on actual institutional conduct -- a so called *"just desserts"* model. The overall goal is to use both *static* risk factors such as an inmate's criminal history and current offense, and *dynamic* factors, such as institutional disciplinary record and performance in treatment and work assignments. The entire process results in a custody designation (minimum, medium, close, or maximum) which influences the designation of an appropriate security level. In this manner, *custody* reflects the inmate's classification level, while *security* refers to the physical environment of the facility to which the inmate is assigned. The overall goal is to ensure a match between the inmate's custody level and the facility's security level (minimum custody inmates assigned to minimum security beds or facilities).

Needs classification identifies the mental health treatment, educational, and training needs of an individual inmate. This information is used to determine in which programs or special services the inmate should be participate while incarcerated to enhance adjustment to the facility and to reduce the risk of recidivism. When combined with the inmate's custody level, it further refines the decisions surrounding to which facility an inmate will be assigned. For example, inmates classified as medium custody who have educational needs should be transferred to a medium security facility where such educational services are available. Similar to the external classification system, needs assessments should include an initial and reclassification phase to reflect changes in the inmates' programmatic needs while incarcerated.

Internal classification occurs when an inmate arrives at a prison or housing unit after his/her custody level has been established. This phase of classification is facility-based and requires structured decisions on issues such as: housing, programs, and work assignments. Internal classification addresses the questions of:

- In which housing unit should the inmate be placed?

- In what programs should the inmate participate? and

- To what type of work should the inmate be assigned?

Currently, most prisons systems have less structured internal classification systems which can often result in serious incidents or high-profile escapes. Often, inmates are inappropriately housed, programmed or improperly separated. For example, if a prison operates a residential substance abuse program, it would not be appropriate for inmates with life sentences to be in the program, as they would consume program resources best used for inmates nearing their release dates.

Community risk is the focus of the next classification phase in which inmates are considered for release from the secure facility for work details, pre-release preparations, or parole. The type of risk to be assessed is focused on public safety or, put differently, the likelihood of committing a new crime. Some correctional systems (e.g., Washington state) are beginning to develop strategies to assure public safety. At this stage, staff are <u>not</u> classifying inmates based on their risk of involvement in institutional management problems, but instead are classifying inmates based on their risk of committing a crime in the community.

Community risk assessment is linked with needs associated with educational achievements, vocational skills, substance abuse, and relationships. For example, an inmate has a greater chance of not recidivating if she/he has gainful employment. The needs assessment would indicate if he/she has adequate vocational skills to enable him/her to work and maintain employment in the community. This implies that inmates with poor vocational skills should receive vocational training prior to their release from custody. This creates a dilemma among classification staff who must consider the inmate's placement in the community based upon his/her need for training and/or treatment, particularly if the department of corrections does not have adequate programming and treatment resources to address the offender's needs. The next question is, "Should a prison system <u>be responsible</u> for reducing the inmate's community risk level prior to his/her release from a prison facility?"

Truth in Sentencing (TIS) and three strikes legislation have had significant impact on classification. Issues raised by the forum's participants, for example, included:

- What are the effects of determinate sentencing legislation on classification systems?

- How do you motivate the offender to conform to institutional rules if his/her behavior does not influence the length of incarceration?

- In systems with determinant and/or TIS policies in which the length of stay is no longer a predictor of behavior, the role of the conditions of stay (i.e., privileges per custody level) becomes more critical to inmate management.

3.   Management Information Systems - Classification Data for Planning

Discussant: Meesim Lee, Branch Chief for Management Information Services
South Carolina Department of Corrections

The South Carolina Department of Corrections received a grant from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to form a practitioner-researcher partnership with the COMPLETE Center of the Graduate School of Business at the College of William and Mary to develop personal computer-based (PC) software to simulate the interactive dynamics of prison classification policies, sentence structure, inmate behavior, and prison bed type requirements. The product of this partnership, The Dynamic Simulation Model (DSM), applies classification scenarios to the current and projected future inmate attributes, manages "heads and beds," predicts future bed-type mix, and generates a cost-effective classification model.

DSM links actual facility-based operational data and concepts with modern information system technology. The DSM includes a data warehouse, objective-oriented computing, Monte Carlo simulation, and On-Line Analysis Processing (OLAP). To simulate the impact of changes to classification policies and procedures on the type and number of prison beds required, DSM provides for interactive access to the data and the option of specifying the criteria for evaluating the classification decisions at the "front end" of the simulation.

DSM contains three primary components: 1.) data warehouse construction; 2.) assessment of the impact of classification policies on the current prison population; and 3.) simulation of classification policies on both current and future prison populations. It can also produce both classification and simulation statistical reports. These reports can be expanded into lists of inmates to facilitate, for example, tracking the impact of a simulation on a particular inmate or group of inmates. These reports can be further expanded to include individual inmate attributes. All reports can be exported to Microsoft Office applications for additional analysis and presentations.

DSM can be installed on most personal computer systems with the following specifications: 400 Megahertz PC or higher, at least 256 megabytes of memory, and a zip-drive or Network connection. DSM will work with a variety of software packages: Microsoft Windows 98 or later, Microsoft Excel 97 (or later); and Microsoft Access 97 (or later). Currently, the final report and users manual are under review at the National Institute of Justice. DSM can address some of the practical questions raised by prison administrators such as:

- **How many of what type of beds?** DSM has enabled the SC DOC to examine the impact of the implementation of recent truth-in sentencing legislation on prison classification policies and future bed requirements. DSM, for example, derived an objective classification custody level from aggregate data on inmate attributes and behavior with the goal of "matching beds with heads." In other words, the impact of classification policy changes and legislation were simulated based upon an analysis of aggregate inmate profiles and behavior to determine the types and number of beds required to manage the projected inmate population. The key to these analyses was access to accurate data on individual inmates.

- **What kinds of beds?** There are two major factors that effect an agency's ability to effectively match heads with beds: inmate management and agency planning. For the

individual inmate, classification controls his/her movement within and between the facilities and program participation, i.e., inmate management. On the system-level, classification determines resource requirements and utilization, i.e., agency planning.

- **What beds to build by when?** The key issues to resolve is the bed-type mix. Bed-type mix is dependent on offender attributes (age, criminal history, and institutional behavior) and prison classification system policies and practices. There are four important classification factors to consider: severity of offense, prior criminal history, remaining time-to-serve, and institutional behavior. All of these factors together have an impact on the placement of offenders within prison facilities and when the respective types of bed/facilities will be needed.

- **How do modifications to the classification policy impact bed space requirements?** Truth-in-sentencing (TIS) has increased the length of stay among offenders of violent crimes in South Carolina, which affects the distribution of offenders along the classification continuum. TIS has also increased the need for maximum security beds. Under TIS, due to their time to serve, offenders tend to stay longer in maximum custody, which effects the bed-type mix needed at other security levels. Because TIS inmates have higher rates of infractions, their disciplinary issues also result in their movement to higher security beds.

For the baseline projection, DSM simulates for each inmate and each future admission, movement, number of disciplinary infractions, and institutional assignment. The program sums the number of inmates in each custody level for each time period. To simulate the impact of changes to the current classification policy, "a new classification policy" is specified, the calculations are repeated, and then the number of inmates per custody level and type of facility are compared with the current or baseline simulation results. The number and variation of the simulations are limited only by the creativity and time of the department and the availability of the data elements to be considered in the classification decisions.

DSM not only provides important information on future bed space requirements, but also describes the current system. Analysis of South Carolina's prison data, for example, revealed that the new TIS law has resulted in longer prison stays and that offenders sentenced under TIS have higher rates of institutional infractions than comparable non-TIS inmates. Under TIS, the length of stay among inmates incarcerated for violent crimes has increased by 25 to 100 percent, depending on the specific type of crime.

Between January 1, 1996 and December 31, 1998, 3,643 violent offenders were sentenced, 1,253 of which committed crimes before January 1, 1996 and were not sanctioned under the TIS statute. The other 2,390 offenders committed crimes on or after January 1, 1996 and were sanctioned under the TIS statute. These TIS and non-TIS inmates share the same attributes, except time to serve.

Comparisons of the TIS and non-TIS inmates by age and number of institutional infractions revealed that TIS inmates are more prone to disciplinary infractions than non-TIS inmates within the same age group, and younger TIS inmates are more prone to disciplinary infractions than older TIS inmates. Thus, TIS has impacted not only the number of beds required at each classification level but has also prompted changes in the classification criteria that define the respective custody levels. The effects were most dramatic at the maximum security levels where offenders with lengthy sentences and/or repetitive, serious institutional infractions stay for longer periods of time. The model also indicated that within the

next ten years the inmate population in South Carolina would increase significantly with the extension of TIS to non-violent offenders.

4. **Linking Department of Corrections to Local Jails**

Discussant: **Stan Repko, Director Office of Policy and Planning**
New Jersey Department of Corrections

The New Jersey Department of Corrections (NJDOC) has successfully implemented an objective jail classification system. This project was accomplished through the collaborative efforts of the New Jersey Department of Corrections, the New Jersey County Warden's Association, and the New Jersey Administrative Office of the Courts. This effort took several years of planning, a collaborative strategy, and funding from a host of sources including: National Institute of Corrections-Prison Division and the United States Department of Justice.

In 1993, NJ DOC designed and pilot tested a statewide classification system for the state's correctional system. The classification system was implemented over a 14-month period, that included the re-engineering of the state's registration and assignment process, as well as the reclassification of all of the state's 24,500 inmates. This re-classification process increased the number of inmates assigned to minimum custody, and also decreased the number of infractions and escapes.

In 1996, the New Jersey County Jail Wardens' Association formed an Objective Jail Classification (OJC) User Requirements Committee, which worked with the NJDOC Classification Bureau and the NJ Administrative Office of the Courts Information System Division to design classification instruments and specify the software requirements for the County Correctional Information System (CCIS). By 1997, the user requirements, classification instruments, software requirements were fully specified.

In September 1997, the OJC system was pilot tested for two months at the Ocean County Jail. The pilot project resulted in several procedural changes and a few minor software modifications. Given the success of the pilot test, the Committee developed a statewide implementation plan that called for the conversion of New Jersey's 21 county jails to the OJC system over an 18-to-24 month period. There are several benefits to the implementation of the new system, which include:

- Standardization and uniformity of key terms and definitions across all county jail inmates, offense codes, disciplinary infractions, and statuses;

- Immediate online access to current and prior admissions and releases for all state and local correctional facilities throughout the state;

- Access to a validated, objective jail inmate classification system to reduce legal liability and effectively and efficiently manage the inmate population;

- Automatic warrant/wanted inquiry for each admission/discharge;

- Automatic NJ DOC notification upon an offender's admission to and departure from any county jail in the state.

- Standardized disciplinary reports on state inmates housed in county jails;

- Standardized managements reports on state inmates housed in county jails;

- Identification of non-finger printed offenders;

- Standardized and uniform data for NJ DOC objective classification system; and

- Online access to CCIS information to all components of the criminal justice system.

Future classification-related initiatives anticipated by the NJ DOC are to complete the development of an internal classification system for highly-aggressive inmates, evaluate the validity of its classification process for female offenders, and continue with the development of its comprehensive classification continuum.

5. Prison Internal Classification Systems

Discussant: **Patricia Hardyman, Ph.D., Executive Research Director**
The Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections

Now that external classification systems are operating relatively smoothly for most states, more attention is focused the internal classification systems. Internal classification entails the process of matching the inmates to housing units, work assignments, and programming. NIC has funded three initiatives to develop, document, and assess internal classification systems. The Institute staff worked directly with eight states to develop, implement, or improve their current internal classification systems:

- **Colorado Department of Corrections** developed an objective classification system for close custody inmates at their Limon Correctional Institution (LCI). Most inmates are placed at LCI for one of two reasons, either for predatory, disruptive behavior in a lower security facility or because of the severity of the current offense or length of sentence. The objective of the internal classification system was to separate the predatory, close custody inmates from the potential prey.

- **Connecticut Department of Corrections** (CT DOC) also designed an internal classification system for its close custody population. However, the CT DOC created a system to assign inmates to housing units according to their work and/or programming assignments.

- **Washington State Department of Corrections** was interested in designing a comprehensive classification system that would classify and manage inmates. The goal was to create an internal classification system to identify appropriate housing, to schedule programming, and to provide strategies for managing the inmate. After reviewing the current literature, the AIMS was selected as the unit management strategy, in combination with the CMC approach to manage individual behavior. Despite its preliminary success, the internal classification initiative based upon the AIMS was not implemented because the

offender groups identified via AIMS duplicated the offender typology identified under the CMC. Completion of the AIMS checklists essentially doubled the staff's workload without providing additional information for managing the population. Ultimately, CMC was preferred over AIMS because it provided more direct input into the development of case management plans. The practice of housing offenders according to their 'personality' type created greater stress and disruption, particularly within the Alpha (predatory) units. It was observed that the separation of high-risk offenders tended to dilute tensions across all housing units, a policy that contradicted AIMS.

- **New Jersey Department of Corrections** developed an internal classification system that would distinguish between groups of maximum custody inmates with differing levels of aggression, in order to make safe and appropriate housing assignments within the maximum security facilities. The plan was to house highly aggressive inmates at a special unit at the Northern State Prison. Completion of the design and implementation of the internal custody classification was halted pending development of the Department's new information system.

- **Florida Department of Corrections** embarked on an ambitious process for system-wide implementation of a highly complex risk and needs model that would identify both internal management issues as well as programming and job-related needs. The model's complexity required sophisticated software and automation for system-wide implementation. Despite these significant challenges, Florida has successfully implemented and automated this system in all of its 141 correctional facilities. (A more detailed description of the Risk and Needs Model is provided in following presentation by FL DOC).

- **Oregon Department of Corrections** implemented a behavior-based system to improve the specification and compatibility of housing assignments in both men's and women's correctional facilities. The original plan was to create independent systems for its male and female populations with different criteria and scoring procedures. However upon analysis, separate systems for male and female inmates did not appeared to be warranted. The system has been successfully automated and implemented throughout the OR DOC system. This system is ripe for continued research to ascertain its validity and reliability.

- **Missouri Department of Corrections,** prior to this initiative, used the AIMS to classify its inmates according to personality typologies that dictated housing compatibility. In order to improve the accuracy and utility of this system, Missouri (in partnership with South Dakota Department of Corrections) developed the Adult Internal Classification System (AICS), modeled after the AIMS. The initial pilot test results indicated low inter-rater reliability, however accuracy and reliability improved upon further refinement of the instruments and training.

In the spring of 2001, a NIC publication entitled, "Internal Prison Classification Systems: Case Studies in their Development and Implementation" will be released. The report summarizes the internal classification initiatives of the eight states and provides a step-by-step process for designing and implementing an internal classification system.

6.   Automated Risk and Needs

Discussant: S. Fred Roesel, Chief Bureau of Classification and Central Records
Florida Department of Corrections

Florida Department of Correction's internal classification system, "Risk and Needs" determines housing assignments, work assignments, and program assignments based upon behavioral criteria using data from inmate interviews, criminal histories, needs assessments and other information available in the Department's data base. Need scores or ratings for 12 to 13 factors are generated. These include, but are not limited to attitude and motivation; restructuring potential; academic achievement; vocational needs; substance abuse needs; work competency; work release; outside work; Pride/Pie;[1] external classification custody level; internal management; outside influences; housing; wellness; life skills; and transition programming.   The classification staff meets with each inmate to develop a management plan with individualized goals and objectives for the inmate's time while incarcerated. The inmate receives a copy of this plan. This plan is reviewed and updated as part of the ongoing classification process.

A central part of the Risk and Needs process is determining the type of housing appropriate for the inmate based on objective criteria driven by behavior. On the individual level, the system recommends the appropriate bed type (secure cell, room, or open day dorm) and on the system-level, it provides justification for budget requests regarding the usage of each housing type.   Risk and Needs also recommends work assignments according to the inmate's work skills and habits, appropriateness for work release or outside work (risk of flight, threat to public safety, etc.) and the availability of prison industries positions. The FL DOC offers a variety of programming, including substance abuse treatment, academic education, vocational training, and other less-intensive programing. The inmate's need for each type of programming is rated on a scale of one to five (five indicating high need), based on interview and background history data.

The system also has the ability to rank inmates statewide for placement in academic education, substance abuse, vocational education, and work release programs. Automated reports are generated for all institutions, regional offices, and the central office to notify staff as the inmate's relative priority for admission to the targeted program or work assignment. As of July 3, 2000, substance abuse programming was made mandatory for all offenders with high substance abuse needs. To assist staff in the assignment of inmates to the various substance abuse programs, the system was designed to identify and rank all inmates according to their need for placement in a substance abuse treatment slot.   An inmate whose substance abuse ranking is less than or equal to 500 has the highest priority for treatment. If an inmate refuses to participate in the program, he/she receives a disciplinary report. It is anticipated that in the near future, academic and vocational education will also become mandatory programing assignments.

In sum, the FL DOC maintains a comprehensive classification system in which Risk and Needs is integrated with the custody assessment and reassessment system (CARS), gain time calculations, visitation, I.A.P.S. (facility placement), appointment and contact log, and the transition plan. In the future, the Department plans to further integrate the external custody system, automate work and treatment progress reports, and automate work and program assignments. If the programs become mandatory, the FL DOC

---

[1]PRIDE stands for the FDOC Prison Rehabilitative Industries and Diversified Enterprises or PIE (Prison Industries Enhancement) Program. The criteria assesses the inmate's need for new or enhanced training skills.

will also integrate mandatory academic and vocational education in the Risk and Needs system. Efforts are also being made to develop web-based applications for the classification system. The Priority Program Ranking System's Top 500 lists are available for staff to sort and view on the Department's intranet web site. The list includes photo access of each inmate.

7. AICS: Personality Based Model

Discussant: Ed Ligtenberg, Director of Classification, Transfers and Scheduling South Dakota Department of Corrections

The South Dakota Department of Corrections (SD DOC) has been working on a new and innovative personality-based model for classifying inmates, the Adult Internal Classification System (AICS). The SD DOC currently uses AIMS, a personality-based system that does not allow for changes in the inmate's personality profile; in contrast, AICS allows for consideration of changes in personality over time. An inmate serving a sentence of 30 years, for example, may come into prison as a "bad guy" but over time, he may evolve to the other end of the behavioral spectrum. The AICS system is designed to identify and separate inmates based on their personality types. The goal is to separate the predator from the prey, separate victimizers from the victim prone, i.e., separate the "good guys" from the "bad guys" when everyone is wearing a "black hat."

AICS is a sorting method that assigns inmates to housing units according to similar interests and behavior patterns. The purpose of AICS is to provide a safer, more relaxed living environment. The sorting process starts with custody classification (maximum, medium, and minimum) which determines facility placement. Next, the AICS score is computed to determine housing unit placement. Each inmate is assigned to one of three offender types. The scores range from 1 to 3 with 1 indicating aggressive, 2 indicating not excessively aggressive or dependent, and 3 indicating dependent or victim-prone. A Type 1 inmate should not be housed with a Type 3 inmate, but Type 2 inmates could be housed with either type. Other factors that determine cell placement are gang membership, race, common sense, correctional judgement, prior adjustment problems with roommates, and correctional staff knowledge of which inmates are compatible. The characteristics of the respective groups are:

- **Type 1** inmates display or have histories of hostile, aggressive, and/or violent behavior. These inmates are hostile to authority and often attempt to deal with others by conning or manipulative behaviors. They are resentful of rules and regulations and of staff efforts to control them. They are easily bored and create excitement to amuse themselves. Staff generally see them as untrustworthy and unreliable. Some inmates in this group may not be directly confrontational, but instead may tend to cause problems by operating behind the scenes.

- **Type 2** inmates are neither excessively aggressive nor dependent, although the experience of being in prison may be demoralizing to them. Most do not have extensive criminal histories or consider themselves "criminals." They have a low rate of disciplinary problems and are rarely involved in assaults, extortion, or threatening behaviors. Usually they avoid trouble and will fight only as a last resort.

- **Type 3** inmates are withdrawn, sluggish, unhappy, passive, constantly worried, anxious, afraid, jittery, easily upset, unhappy, and often give the impression of being out of it. They appear sad, depressed, and tense. They are easily victimized by Type 1 inmates since they are often friendless and are perceived as weak, indecisive, and submissive. They do not have a high rate of disciplinary problems and are viewed by staff as demanding, whining, and clinging.

Three different AICS instrument are used to classify inmates. The History Checklist is completed within the first week of an inmate's incarceration by unit staff based on a review of the inmate's record and an interview with the inmate. This list describes the inmate's previous behavior, personality and experiences both on the street and during prior incarcerations. The History Checklist is completed for all new inmates and for parole violators.

The Initial Behavioral Checklist is completed during the second week of an inmate's incarceration. This checklist is completed by a correctional officer based on that officer's observation of the inmate's behavior since admission, and the unit staff's observation of the inmate's behavior during the interview conducted for the History Checklist. The Initial Behavior Checklist is designed to describe the inmate's observed behavior during the current incarceration.

The last AICS instrument is the Reclassification Behavioral Checklist which is completed one year after the Initial Behavioral Checklist and annually, thereafter. This checklist is completed by a correctional officer based on that officer's observation of the inmate's behavior and unit staff's reports on the inmate's performance. Implementation of the AICS is pending research that demonstrates that AICS is better, or at least as good, as AIMS.

8. Managing High Risk Offenders

Discussant: **Pam Brandon, Administrator Division of Program Planning and MVT Wisconsin Department of Corrections**

To meet the growing needs of the correctional system, the Wisconsin Department of Corrections (WI DOC) constructed a supermax correctional institution. This facility was designed to house up to 500 inmates with serious behavioral problems. Generally, inmates in administrative or segregation status who have demonstrated one or more of the following behaviors within a secure confinement setting will be reviewed for transfer to the supermax facility:

- Assaultive, violent, or sexually aggressive acts toward other inmates;

- Pose safety risks within the institutional setting, such as involvement in gang-related behaviors, predatory acts toward others, and/or victimization of staff; and

- Represent major security risk such as escape or flight, demonstrated capacity to incite disturbance, active participation in a riot or disturbance, and/or threatening the orderly operation of the facility while within the general prison population.

Inmates are sent to the supermax facility for an indeterminate period of 24 to 36 months, during which they are afforded opportunities to demonstrate appropriate behavior that will allow for their transition to a less restrictive or controlled status. The goal of this process is to eventually return the inmates to a general population maximum security setting. The basic objective is to influence positive behavior through a level system that provides for increased privileges based upon positive behaviors. Movement between levels within the facility is not a classification function, but a management function that constantly seeks input from everyone involved in the day-to-day interactions with the inmate. There are five levels within the facility:

- **Level One:** Upon reception, the inmate is assessed by the psychological, social service, education, management, and security staff. The result of this assessment is an individualized program plan for the inmate.

- **Level Two:** Initial placement in the institution is in the Alpha Unit which is a highly controlled environment with very limited activity. Inmates stay in this unit for a minimum of 30 days.

- **Level Three:** If an inmate behaves positively in the Alpha Unit, he moves to the supermax General Housing Unit for program participation. While in this Unit, programming to promote positive behavior is provided via video. Inmates remain in this Unit for nine to 18 months.

- **Level Four:** Based on their behavior at Level Three, inmates will progress to the Transition Unit where additional privileges are provided, including group programming and leisure activities.

- **Level Five:** After four to six months at Level Four, inmates may be considered for return to a less controlled maximum-security facility.

9. Responding to Litigation

Discussant: **James Austin, Co-Director**
Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections

The following is a list of recent litigation that focused on classification issues:

- ***Busey et al. v. Corrections Corporation of America*** (external and internal classification issues): This private prison was sued by persons in Ohio (who were upset about private prisons coming into the State) for failing to operate properly when inmates were killed by other inmates. The external classification issue was that the predatory inmates who were transfers from the Washington D.C. Department of Corrections that did not meet the profile (minimum or medium custody) of those who were approved for placement in the Youngstown facility. The Youngstown facility was also sued for failure to collect all necessary classification information regarding inmate transfers.

- **New Mexico Department of Corrections** (external and internal classification issues): In this case, inmates and staff were killed in a facility operated by Wackenhut. The Central Office for the New Mexico Department of Corrections was unaware of who they were transferring to non-DOC facilities. In addition, Wackenhut was not duly diligent in terms of assessing new admissions to their facility and having an internal classification system that properly identified and separated predatory inmates.

- **Oklahoma Department of Corrections** (internal classification issue): Oklahoma was sued by the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division for separating inmates by race. They never asked inmates if they would mind being in a cell with a person of another race. The fundamental issue in this case was that inmates cannot be housed based on an item or factor that is not specified as a part of the classification criteria or that may be a violation of civil rights.

- **Camden County, New Jersey** (external and internal classification): This was a case of erroneously detention by a county jail. A mildly mentally challenged individual who was not fluent in English left the facility to go to court, the court dropped the charges against him, but for some reason, the paperwork did not get back to the institution. The inmate was erroneously detained for six months in the jail. The Department of Corrections was deemed responsible for knowing the legal status of everyone within their custody. This was considered a fundamental communication issue. Defense counsel argued that the classification process was relevant because whenever an inmate enters a correctional facility, a complete assessment that includes collection and review of all relevant commitment orders and records are mandatory. If the records are not present at admission, the inmate needs to be put in an "unclassified status" until the records are present and reviewed. Regarding internal classification, the inmate was erroneously classified as high/close custody and was placed in an unit with predatory inmates. (He was repeated assaulted by the other inmates in the unit.)

- *USA v. Michigan and Cain v. Michigan* (external and internal classification issues): The Michigan Department of Corrections was ordered by a consent decree to develop a separate female classification system because the women were over-classified when assessed on the instrument based upon the male population.

- *Hammer v. King County,* Seattle Washington (external classification and personnel): The primary litigation issue this case was a personnel issue. Women were not allowed to work in the correctional facilities outside of the sight of a male correctional officer (i.e., male correctional officers must be present at all times). This policy denied opportunities for certain positions and promotions for women. The classification question was, "Were the inmates so dangerous that they could not be supervised by a female correctional officer?"

- **California Department of Corrections** (internal classification): In California, two inmates were placed in a prison cell, one was classified at Level 1 (low risk) and the other was classified at Level 4 (high risk). The Level 4 inmate sexually assaulted the Level 1 inmate. With a systematic internal classification system, these two inmates would have never been placed in the same cell.

- ***Inmates A, B, C and D v. Illinois Department of Corrections*** (internal classification issue): This case centered on a gang (security threat group) separation issue. Gangs were controlling the housing and work assignments. The Department was required to develop an internal classification system to monitor the number and type of gang members assigned to each housing unit and type of work assignments and to distribute the various gang members across housing units, job assignments, and programming to minimize their power within the institution.

10. Winning Classification Systems - Montana

Discussant: Candyce Neubauer, Bureau Chief, Technical Correctional Services Montana Department of Corrections

In 1991, a disturbance occurred in the maximum-security unit of the Montana State Prison (MSP). Five protective custody inmates were killed by other maximum custody inmates. Soon thereafter, several wrongful death lawsuits against Montana Department of Corrections (MT DOC) were filed by family members of the victims, other inmates, and correctional officers in the facility at the time of the riot. This presentation focuses on the litigation filed by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the United States Government.[2]   The ACLU filed a lawsuit against the MT DOC regarding the conditions of confinement throughout MSP, not just the maximum-security unit. The issues contested were medical, dental, and mental health services; overcrowding; quality of the physical plant; classification and programming; criteria for placement/retention in the maximum-security unit; good time; and violations of the American Disabilities Act.

On November 29, 1994, the State of Montana and the ACLU entered into a settlement agreement relating to the conditions of confinement at MSP. This settlement agreement included several changes in MT DOC policies regarding the provision of proper medical, dental, and mental health care; maintenance of the physical plant; implementation of an objective classification system and individualized treatment plan; improvement of security; and compliance with the American Disabilities Act. The agreement included:

- Appoint of a medical director responsible for developing and implementing a comprehensive system of medical care;

- Retain adequate physician coverage to meet the needs of the MSP population;

- Retain of adequate nursing staff to provide 24-hour coverage and to otherwise meet the needs of the MSP population;

- Screen inmates and staff for tuberculosis according to the Center for Disease Control guidelines by trained personnel;

---

[2]Langford, et al v. Gov. Racicot, et al (Cause No. CV 92-13-H-LBE) and United States of America, Plaintiff v. Civil Action no. 94-90-H-CCL, State of Montana, et al., Defendants.

- Screen the medical needs of all new inmates within 24 hours of admission (excluding weekends) by nursing staff, followed-up by physician's assistant and/or physician;

- Have sick call clinics daily to ensure inmates are seen by medical staff within 48 hours of request;

- Have sick call daily in the maximum-security unit by nursing staff;

- Refer patients to physician within five days;

- Provide over-the-counter medication and products for common ailments;

- Conduct annual physicals for prisoners over 50 years of age;

- Conduct biannual physicals for prisoners over the age of 40;

- Develop a chronic care policy;

- Provide eyeglasses and replacements, as needed;

- Provide dental care within 60 days of admission, sooner if a problem is indicated;

- Eliminate the dental list backlog within one year;

- Retain a part-time psychiatrist (at least 20 hours weekly) to develop and implement a comprehensive mental health plan in consultation with plaintiff's psychiatric consultant;

- Provide eight hours out-of-cell time daily for general population prisoners;

- Develop a preventive maintenance program;

- Comply with State Building and Fire Codes;

- Attend to housing unit work orders within 48 hours;

- Implement an objective classification system;

- Coordinate treatment plans with the parole board;

- Review treatment plans annually with the parole board;

- Prioritize eligibility for treatment programs based on parole board mandates and parole eligibility;

- Develop and adhere to a disciplinary handbook, to be made available to all prisoners;

- Do not place inmates in temporary lock-up based on information from a confidential informant;

- Implement the NIC recommendations relevant to the 1991 riot at the maximum- security unit;

- Repair all unit intercom systems;

- Provide adequate security staff and training;

- Conduct weekly mental health rounds;

- Preserve current stratification program as it relates to Levels One through Four, including all rights and privileges, T.V., recreation, etc.;

- Create a Level Five for prisoners not eligible for return to general population with enhanced privileges and out-of-cell time;

- Offer anger management and individualized study programs; and

- Remove all barriers to programs and services.

The United States Department of Justice (USDOJ) filed litigation against MT DOC's for failure to protect MSP inmates from harm and risk regarding: predatory inmates (identifying housing, single cell, transfer); security practices in the maximum security unit; and vulnerable inmates (identification, transfer, housing, mainstreaming, special management housing, reports of harm, separation needs and cell compatibility). In January 1997, MT DOC entered into an agreement with the USDOJ to resolve the issues of inmate protection. The parties agreed that the case would be dismissed upon full compliance with the agreement. To date, the DOJ has not certified the MT DOC's compliance and it continues to be monitored. To ensure protection of the inmates, MT DOC agreed to complete the following tasks:

- Modify the classification policy and instrument to identify predatory and vulnerable inmates;

- Modify the classification policy so that reconsideration of classification is automatic for serious or violent institutional offenses;

- Establish a written policy with objective criteria for single and double-celling;

- Develop a policy for supplying relevant information about predatory behavior, vulnerability, and separation needs to any receiving institution upon an inmate's transfer to that facility;

- Formalize special management status by modifying the policy, undertaking a study of the special management-related procedures within the maximum security unit, and providing specific criteria for determining an appropriate and safe setting for protective custody inmates;

- Formalize the policy for handling inmates expressing concerns for their safety;

- Develop a policy to address safety concerns when new medium inmates end up housed on the close custody unit due to lack of bed space;

- Develop an uniform policy to address homosexual activity;

- Develop a policy for scheduling use of the maximum security unit day room;

- Install smoke detectors in common areas of housing units;

- Provide routine fire safety training and at least quarterly fire drills;

- Conduct a feasibility study of the expansion of visitation; and

- Develop policy and procedures restricting inmate access to sensitive information.

In an effort to fulfill the classification-related tasks outlined in the ACLU settlement agreement, in August, 1993, the Department requested technical assistance from NIC for Dr. Patricia Hardyman to design and validate an objective external classification system. In May 1997 and July, 1998, in response to the US DOJ settlement agreement, MT DOC's objective classification system was revalidated. The purpose of the 1998 Revalidation initiative was to pilot test the modifications to the classification instruments and policy recommendations by Dr. Hardyman derived from the changes to the classification systems suggested by the 1997 Revalidation effort.

As a result of the technical assistance offered, two policies were developed:

Special management of atypical inmates: This policy concerned the management of predatory, vulnerable, disabled, mental health, youthful offender, witnesses, informants, high profile offenders, and gang affiliated inmates; and

Separation needs: This policy focused on the procedures for identifying and separating inmates with conflicts, e. g., co-defendants, victims (relatives to victims), gang members, etc.

The respective policies included operational definitions, procedures, and observation forms. In addition, the external classification policy was modified to coincide with these new policies. For example, the classification procedures were modified to account for automatic reclassification of violent/assaultive rule violators and to direct the placement of inmates when housing availability did not match the inmates' custody level. Both the initial and reclassification instruments were modified to include a new risk item that considered institutional predatory behavior and to adjust the custody scale to identify maximum custody inmates based on their total risk score. Training on these new policies and the classification system is currently ongoing.

11.   Responding to Litigation: Winning Classification Systems - Michigan

**Discussant: Nicholas Ludwick, Classification Director Correctional Facilities
Administration Michigan Department of Corrections**

Michigan's Department of Corrections (MIDOC) is currently in the middle of a lengthy law suit, *Cain v. MIDOC*, which began in 1988. The litigation started with prisoner property rights and has now shifted to classification. Classification became an issue because the MIDOC has six classification levels — the higher the custody level, the more restricted are property rights, the more time is spent the cell, and less access to programs.

This presentation focuses on the litigation as it relates to female classification issues. The MIDOC has settled with the female plaintiffs and has developed a new classification system for female inmates. The settlement requires the MIDOC to:

- Train all staff who perform classification on the use of the new security classification screens;

- Provide a classification information session as part of the Warden's Forum at orientation;

- Place a copy of the settlement agreement and new classification screens in each law library;

- Provide notice to MI DOC staff that work and school reports must be completed in a timely fashion;

- Modify the Prisoner Guidebook and all orientation materials to conform with this agreement;

- Begin using the new initial screening form for all newly committed and returning female prisoners;

- Re-assess all female prisoners currently housed in Level IV using the new screens;
- Re-assess all other general population and protective custody prisoners with the new screens at their annual review;

- Conduct a study on misconduct and classification to validate the instruments;

- Submit a draft of the validation study to plaintiffs;

- Provide a legal writer program at Scott, Crane, and Camp Branch that includes training on hearings for misconducts and appeals to circuit court;

- Add ICLE Family Law Volumes, Michigan Basic Practice Handbook, and ICLE Probate Law Volumes at each institutional library, including any mini law libraries;

- Ensure that Level IV and V prisoners have physical access to the law library (Level IV and V hours may be combined);

- Continue to provide physical access to a full law library for all general population prisoners;

- Provide for prisoners to participate via telephone in court-ordered hearings;

- Send a notice to all Michigan Courts detailing the procedures for contacting prisoners for the hearings;

- Deposit $33,000 into Prisoners' Benefit Fund (PBF) at Scott for resolution of property claims (the institution will facilitate the transfer of these fund into individual prisoners' accounts); and

- Issue athletic shirts for female inmates which may be worn on the yard during athletic activities and in the housing units.

Annual reclassification is mandatory, however an inmate may be re-assessed more frequently upon receipt of a new/modified sentence or finding of guilt for a violent institutional infraction. MIDOC is currently moving female inmates currently housed at the sss facility to a facility located next to the main women's facility. This will allow the two institutions to work together more efficiently and effectively.

12.   Classification of Women Offenders

Discussant: Patricia Hardyman, Executive Director of Research
Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections

The primary issue in the classification of women offenders is the widespread tendency to over-classify. The current external classification instruments tend to score female inmates into a higher custody level than is appropriate, given their threat to the safety and security of the institution. Another major issue is that the instruments were developed for and validated on male inmates. Because the systems have not been assessed for the female population, several states are questioning the validity of their current classification system for women. Another issue that has been raised is the importance of dynamic factors (i.e., mental health, social history, and relationships) in the classification of female inmates. Thus, for a variety of reasons, many states' classification systems need to be fine-tuned or at least, assessed for female offenders to ensure their validity.

In response to this need, NIC has undertaken two women's classification initiatives. Dr. Pat VanVoorhis, at the University of Cincinnati, has surveyed the state correctional agencies to determine their current policies and procedures with respect to assessment of the risk and needs of female inmates. A telephone survey was conducted to learn about the instruments used and the differences in the systems for the male and female inmates. She has also collected data on the extent to which the instruments have been validated and/or evaluated as to their ability to manage the female population accurately and effectively. A report on Dr. VanVoorhis' research will be available by the fall of 2001. Dr. VanVooris is also

providing technical assistance to three state correctional agencies for the revalidation or refinement of their classification systems for their female offenders. The states include Colorado, Nebraska, and Hawaii:

- **Colorado Department of Corrections** is developing a dynamic external classification instrument that will consider such factors as mental health, substance abuse needs, education, etc. A detailed interview protocol has been developed to elicit information on the woman's history of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse both as a child and adult, as well as her parenting skills.

- **Nebraska Department of Corrections** is considering the development of a community risk assessment instrument to inform decisions for work release, work assignments outside the fence, and procedures for transporting inmates.

- **Hawaii Department of Corrections** does not currently utilize a systematic internal or external classification process for their female population. Prior to development and testing of classification system, systemic issues of overcrowding, the programming, etc. must be addressed. In the interim, Hawaii has undertaken the development of a systematic needs assessment instrument to identify the mental health, medical, and programming needs of the female inmate population.

The second NIC women's classification initiative is with The Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections and provides for technical assistance to four state correctional agencies—Florida, Idaho, and West Virginia. The fourth state has not yet been assigned, but will be identified soon. The work in these states entails:

- **Florida Department of Corrections:** Validation of the internal and external classification systems for the female inmate population; development of a systematic needs assessment process that compiles and rates the inmate's mental health, substance abuse, educational, vocational, wellness/life skills, financial management, relationships (both within and outside the penal system), and parenting skills; and refinement of the state's Custody Assessment and Reclassification System (CARS) and Risk and Needs Internal Classification System as appropriate to consider all of the inmate's critical needs.

- **West Virginia Department of Corrections:** Validation of the external classification system for female inmate population with some comparison of the predictive power of the risk factors for the male inmate population to ensure the need for a gender-specific classification system.

- **Idaho Department of Corrections:** Idaho DOC currently has a separate external classification system for its female inmate population. The primary task of this initiative is to update the current system and develop a clear and concise classification manual to enhance the reliability of the system.

13.   Classification of Women Offenders: BOP's Work with Revalidation and Classification of Women Offenders

Discussant: Miles Harer, Senior Research Associate
U.S. Bureau of Prisons

In the late 1980's, a lawsuit was filed against the U.S. Bureau of Prisons (BOP) regarding the conditions in its women's prisons and the inequities in the access to programming between the male and female inmates. Soon thereafter, classification became an issue. Based upon the evidence presented to the court, it appeared that the women were being over-classified due to the weight assigned to offense severity on the classification instrument. Two remedies for this problem were implemented. First, the external classification scale cut points were modified for the females. The second step was to eliminate "medium" as a security level. Thus, only three security ratings--minimal, low, and high–are used for the female population.

The BOP is now reviewing its female designation classification, the system that determines how the woman is managed and her privileges. In an effort to test the validity of the classification process, the BOP created a classification task force of security, programming, and research staff to identify risk components that predict escape. Using a consensus model, history of escape and length of sentence were identified as the most critical factors for predicting escape. Also identified as important factors of escape were family problems, money concerns at home, and a death in the family. The task force also identified six institutional behaviors thought to be predictive of violent behavior---killing/attempting, aggregated assault, weapon possession, fighting, threatening bodily harm, simple assault.

The BOP analyzed historical data on male and female institutional misconduct to determine rates of misconduct by gender for each of the BOP disciplinary infraction codes. The data suggested that female inmates are involved in different types of institutional misconduct and at different rates than the males. Examination of misconduct rates by gender indicated that women tend to be more concerned about their appearance, medical issues, and relationships. Women are also less violent than men. Men are more involved in fighting, gambling, and drug use. This study had two major findings. First, the same risk factors predict male and female inmate institutional misconduct. Therefore, there is no need to construct a separate classification system for female offenders sentenced to federal prisons.

14.   A Dynamic Instrument for Women

Discussant: Scott Hromas, Director of Research
**   Colorado Department of Corrections**

Colorado's Department of Corrections (CO DOC) is currently working with Dr. VanVoorhis, through technical assistance provided by NIC, on a dynamic classification model for its female inmate population. Approximately 1,100 female inmates are housed in CO DOC correctional facilities. Although the current system has four classification levels, 85 percent of all females are housed in medium, minimum, and minimum-R (restriction) custody levels; with 75 percent classified as minimum or minimum-R.

In the search for a valid classification system, a task force identified three potential approaches to the problem:

•   Make minor changes to the external classification instruments to correct the operational definitions and weights associated with key risk factors, i.e., escape, infractions, current offense, program participation, time to serve, and the custody scale cut points;

•   Consider the role of domestic violence when determining the severity of an offense; and

•   Develop a community corrections risk assessment instrument for predicting recidivism that includes static risk factors (i.e., prior substance abuse, prior criminal record, history of escapes, age at first offense) and gender-responsive dynamic risk factors (i.e., relationships, suicide attempts, and mental health).

The task force decided that the classification process should be expanded to include an assessment of the dynamic needs and risks of women and that a scientific pilot test was required to develop and test the instrument. The risk assessment process would include a diverse set of needs to ensure that the types of needs experienced by females as well as those experienced by males would be considered. Substance abuse, prior history, education, employment status, financial problems, and anti-social neighborhoods are risk factors for recidivism for both men and women. Criminal associations, learning difficulties, anti-social attitudes, and anger management tend to be stronger risk factors among men than among women whereas co-dependent relationships, parenting issues, depression, mental health problems, and trauma/abuse tend to be critical risk factors for women. A study of the predictors of institutional misconduct among a cohort of 1999 female admissions indicated a relationship between mental health, criminal history, and education and institutional misconduct.

CO DOC is planning further research on what female inmates identify as their programming and treatment needs and what additional items should be added to the classification instruments. Focus groups with correctional staff and female inmates were conducted to discuss how problems with relationships in and out of the institution effect women, the role of education achievement in institutional adjustment, and how parenting issues affect female rates of misconduct.

The classification process will be modified according to the research findings. The primary change in the female classification process will be that custody level will be driven by needs, rather than by risk.

It is expected that the classification interview process will take about an hour for women, compared to 45 minutes for men.

15.   Reentry - Linking Prison Classification to Reentry to the Community

Discussant: James Austin, Co-Director
The Institute for Crime, Justice, and Corrections

Approximately 600,000 prisoners are released from correctional institutions each year. This constitutes a public safety issue because our prisons are not adequately preparing inmates for the transition into the community. The U.S. Justice Department is looking for models to limit the risk to the community through coordination of law enforcement and community services. One of the primary issues is that many offenders are released to the communities with the fewest resources, thus dramatically increasing their risk for recidivism.

The question underlying the Justice Department's concerns about re-entry is: "How does the correctional system prepare offenders for release?" As the brain of the correctional system, classification systems must have the capability to identify an offender's needs, particularly the needs that put the offender at high risk for recidivism. This needs assessment process must be initiated upon the offender's admission and management strategies need to be developed to enable the offender to perform better upon release to the community. Also, prison administrators and staff need to reach out to other components of the criminal justice system in order to coordinate the services provided in the community with institutional programming.

Currently jurisdictions are implementing strategic plans to facilitate inmates' transition into society. Nevada, for example, has a seamless transition process that includes pre-release planning to identify the community to which an inmate will be released and the individuals who will work with the offender upon his/her release. The staff in the community initiates their work with the individual even prior to his/her release to identify and reduce the risk factors that may lead to the individual's re-involvement in criminal behavior and/or to violation the conditions of his/her release.

16.   Reentry Linking Prison Classification to Reentry to the Community - Incarceration Planning

Discussant: James Thatcher, Chief of Classification and Treatment
Washington Department of Corrections

The state of Washington has 60,000 people under some form of criminal justice supervision. The 2000 Offender Accountability Act has changed the way offenders are supervised in the community in two ways. First, the range of community custody has increased, meaning the Washington Department of Corrections (WA DOC) can now place additional stipulations on the conditions of the offender's release to the community, as needed, to reduce the offender's risk of recidivism. Second, the WA DOC is now required to assess the offender's risk continually using the Level of Service Inventory (LSI). The WA DOC also now has greater access to public records. Specifically, the Offender Accountability Act requires:

- As of July 1, 2000, community supervision becomes community custody;

- Sentencing Guidelines Commission will establish a community custody range;

- Courts will sentence offenders to a range of community custody;

- If sex offender treatment is imposed by the court, the treatment provider must be certified;

- DOC may establish and modify additional supervision conditions based on the risk the inmate may pose to community safety;

- DOC must complete a risk assessment of each offender;

- DOC now has jurisdiction over all offenders in community custody;

- DOC must develop a structure of graduated sanctions for violations;

- Offenders have a right to community custody revocation hearings and the hearing officers must report through a different chain of command than Community Corrections Officers (CCO's);

- DOC may transfer collection of legal financial obligations to county clerks or other entities;

- DOC must, in conjunction with Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chief's (WASPC) and counties, establish the jail bed utilization rate and negotiate terms of increase;

- The First Time Offender Waiver changed from two to one year for the completion of court-ordered treatment;

- DOC must develop and monitor transition and relapse prevention strategies for sex offenders;

- CCOs shall be deployed according to the geographic distribution of offenders;

- DOC has authority to access all records maintained by public agencies; and

- DOC must establish a systematic means of assessing the risk an offender poses to community safety.

Classification and supervision of offenders based on risk is expected to increase offender accountability and reduce their threat to the community. The WA DOC's classification policy is that (1) the WA DOC will manage offenders under its jurisdiction based on their risk to re-offend, prior harm to the community, and injury caused to victim(s) and/or potential victim(s); and (2) interventions will be based on dynamic risk factors and prioritized according to the offender's risk. The WA DOC will develop an offender accountability plan (OAP) for all offenders that coordinates custody and treatment needs and

includes supervision strategies to reduce risk and effect positive behavior changes. All offenders are expected to comply with their OAPs. The Department's resources will focus on high-risk offenders.

This year, the WA DOC implemented a risk-management assessment process which classifies offenders based on their risk to re-offend and the nature of the harm of their offense(s). Offenders are classified into four risk management (RM) groups: A, B, C, and D. RM-A offenders pose the highest risk to re-offend. RM-A offenders include those who:

- Score of 41 more on the LSI and a conviction for a violent crime;

- Level 3 sex offenders;

- Designated as dangerously mental ill; and/or

- History of violent and/or threatening behavior.

The OAP is shaped by the offender's risk assessment, risk management classification, and identified risk factors. The OAP takes into consideration the LSI score, acts of violence, offender characteristics, as well as their community risk, victim safety, place safety, and offender associations. These risk factors determine the offender's RM level, which in turn influences the conditions of their community supervision. Prohibitions may be placed on the offenders depending on their dynamic risk factors. Offenders, for example, may be prohibited from going to certain places (such as schools), or people (such as victims, crime partners, and potential victims), and/or they may be required to abstain from certain behaviors (drugs, alcohol, illegal activities, or loitering). In addition, offenders are targeted for interventions such as chemical dependency treatment, sex offender treatment, anger management, day-reporting, employment, and/or education. They may also be required to pay reparations through efforts such as volunteering for a community service program, participating in a reconciliation program, or making payments on any legal financial obligations.

Washington State is committed to ensuring its correctional programs accomplish the goal of making the community safe. The WA DOC is focused on multiple measures to monitor short-term and intermediate outcomes and will develop a results-based management plan for assessing its performance. The results-based management plan will improve resource allocations and will provide an ongoing system of measuring and evaluating performance. While 50 percent of the offenders are low-risk by definition and will not be affected by these programing efforts, the primary focus of the re-entry program is the 15 percent of the offender population identified as high risk.

17. Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Discussant: Sammie Brown, Correctional Program Specialist
National Institute on Corrections

At the end of the two-day forum and strategy session, a discussion was held to address a variety of issues related to the continual growth of the field of classification and its focus within NIC. One of

NIC's original goals for the peer workshop was to receive feedback on NIC's technical assistance process regarding:

- Building relationships to connect practitioners;

- Building consensus on issues;

- Providing credibility in addressing issues;

- Providing correctional leadership; and

- Addressing the needs of small correctional systems.

The participants suggested a number of points for improving the technical assistance process:

- Use agencies' expertise to provide hands-on, practical assistance;

- Provide multiple strategies to avoid problems;

- Invest in training for consultants to ensure consistency in information provided and methodology;

- Fund programs that result in a tangible product within a specific time-frame;

- Develop training programs on re-entry;

- Distribute current information about what is happening in other states;

- Provide opportunities for practitioners to share information on multiple topics in groups composed of central office, research, institutional, custodial, programming and line staff; and

- Set up e-mail message groups for sharing information and networking.

The participants indicated that the following research questions need to be addressed:

- When is it safe to mix medium with maximum/close inmates, and what is the impact of mixing custody levels on institutional safety?

- How does prison management effect prison behavior?

- What are the differences in male and female inmates' behavior?

- What is the relationship between mental health and prison management problems and how do they relate to classification?

- How do learning disabilities effect behavior?

- When should an offender in administration segregation be released? (Need to develop objective criteria/models for safely removing inmates from administrative segregation.)

- What are some feasible methods for managing and evaluating therapeutic communities?

- How does one effectively manage the chronic, mentally ill offender within the prison setting;

- Should sex offender treatment be mandatory? If so, under what conditions? and

- What are the benefits and risks of visitation?

III.   NIC Classification-Related Initiatives

A selected number of relevant ongoing or recently completed classification-related projects supported by NIC and ICJC staff are summarized below. These projects illustrate the extensive work on classification related topics that have been undertaken by correctional agencies to design, validate, and implement intake, risk assessment, and/or classification systems.

External Classification-related projects (1980 - present). ICJC staff have conducted evaluations of or helped to design objective classification systems for California, Colorado, Cook County, Illinois, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Los Angeles, Maine, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York City, Oklahoma, Oregon, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico, Tennessee, Texas, Virgin islands, Washington, D.C., Washington State, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Under a NIC comprehensive classification initiative, ICJC is currently working with the states of Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Kentucky to revalidate their classification systems. In addition, The Institute staff are currently working with the City of Philadelphia to refine its classification system to better identify jail inmates who are appropriate for community-based housing units. The Institute continues to work with the states of Wyoming and Georgia to audit the implementation and development of their classification systems.

Internal Classification Systems (1993 - 1996). Staff of ICJC were awarded a cooperative agreement from NIC to initiate a field test of internal classification systems with three states (Connecticut, Colorado, and Washington state). In addition to the field test, The Institute staff conducted a national survey of existing internal classification methods and submitted a report summarizing the results of the field test and national survey.

Design, Development, and Implementation of Prison Internal Classification Systems (1997 - 2000). This second NIC project continued the work of the initial project and introduced the use of systematic internal classification systems to additional adult prison systems. Staff of the Institute of Crime, Justice and Corrections worked with five states (Florida, Missouri, New Jersey, Oregon, and South Dakota) to develop and pilot test comprehensive internal classification systems that govern housing and program placements at a single test facility within each state. This project was extended to implement the states'

new/revised internal classification systems and to assess their reliability and validity. In addition, follow-up assessments of the systems developed by Connecticut, Colorado, and Washington state were conducted.

Gender-Specific Classification projects (1999 - present). ICJC staff are currently working with Dr. Patricia Van Voorhis at the University of Cincinnati on a NIC initiative to provide technical assistance to three state correctional agencies for the development and testing of gender specific classification systems for women. This initiative will provide assistance to Nebraska, Colorado, and Hawaii. In addition, The Institute has a separate cooperative agreement with NIC to provide technical assistance to the state correctional agencies of Idaho, Florida, and West Virginia to revalidate the classification systems developed for their female inmates.

State and Local Planning for Correctional Population Management in Washington State (1999 - present). Under a cooperative agreement with the Prisons Division of NIC, ICJC collaborated with the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs and Department of Corrections to determine the level of resources (facility, staff, and programmatic) needed to enhance the performance capabilities of the jail system. This project included several tasks: 1) Implement an objective jail classification system; 2) Analyze jail population characteristics and trends; 3) Develop jail capacity projections based on needs, risk and security levels of offenders; 4) Provide fiscal analysis of proposed legislation with bed space impact analysis; 5) Assess and make recommendations to improve the State's capacity to store, retrieve and report on critical offender-based information, needs and trends; and 6) Provide training for agency staff in the utilization and continuation of research activities and forecasting techniques. This project will serve as an example to other jurisdictions for the development of systematic classification, information system, and population management strategies.

Appendix: Resumes, Bios, and Contact Information for All Participants

A.   Cooperative Agreement Resource Providers

James Austin, Ph.D.
Research Professor/Co-Director
The Institute on Crime Justice and Corrections
The George Washington University
1819 H St. NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
Work: (202) 496-6321
Fax: (202) 496-6342
Mobile: (202) 258-2991
E-Mail: Asstin@aol.com

Patricia Hardyman, Ph.D.
Executive Research Director
Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections
The George Washington University
1819 H St, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
Work: (202) 496-6320 (DC)
Fax: (202) 496-6342
E-Mail: hardypurr@aol.com

B.   National Institute of Corrections

Larry Solomon
Deputy Director
National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street, NW
Washington, DC 20534
Phone: (202) 514-4254 or (800) 995-6423, ext. 44254
E-Mail: lsolomon@bop.gov

Sammie D. Brown
Correctional Program Specialist
National Institute of Corrections, Prisons Division
320 First Street, NW
Washington, DC 20534
Phone: (202) 514-0058 or (800) 995-6423, ext. 40058
E-Mail: sbrown@bop.gov

C.   Forum Participants

Pamela J. Brandon
Administrator, Division of Program Planning and MVT
Wisconsin Department of Corrections
PO Box 8980
Madison, WI 53708-8980
Phone: (608) 267 -9073
FAX: (608) 267-1751
E-Mail: pamela.brandon@doc.state.wi.us

Gerry Gaes, Ph.D.
Chief, Office of Research and Evaluations
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW Bldg. 400
Washington, DC 20534
Phone: (202) 307 -3871 ext. 115
FAX: (202) 307 -5888
E-Mail: ggaes@bop.gov

Miles Harer
Senior Research Associate
United States Sentencing Commission
Thurgood Marshall Judiciary Building
One Columbus Circle, N.E.
Suite 2-500
Washington, DC 20002-8002
Phone: (202) 502-4579
E-Mail: mharer@ussc.gov

William Harrison
Director of Inmate Services
Pennsylvania Department of Corrections
PO Box 598
Camp Hill, PA 17001-0598
Phone: (717) 730-2707
FAX: (717) 731-7159
E-Mail: bharrison@cor.state.pa.us

Scott Hromas
Director of Research
Colorado Department of Corrections
2862 South Circle Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80906-4195
Phone: (719) 226-4380
FAX: (719) 226-4755
E-Mail : scott.hromas@doc.state.co.us

Meesim Lee
Branch Chief for Management Information Services
Division of Resource and Information Management
South Carolina Department of Corrections
PO Box 21787
Columbia, SC 29221
Phone: (803) 896-8526
FAX: (803) 896-3986
E-Mail: Lee.MeeSim@doc.state.sc.us

Ed Ligtenberg
Director of Classification, Transfers and Scheduling
South Dakota State Penitentiary
PO Box 5911
Sioux Falls, SD 57117 -5911
Phone: (605) 367 -5020
FAX: (605) 367 -5115
Pager: (605) 331-8295
E-Mail: edl@sdsp.state.sd.us

Nick Ludwick
Classification Director Correctional Facilities Administration
Michigan Department of Corrections
PO Box 30003
Lansing, MI 48909
Phone: (517) 373-0287
FAX: (517) 373-3882
E-Mail: ludwicnj@state.mi.us

Candyce Neubauer,
Bureau Chief, Technical Correctional Services
Montana Department of Corrections,
Montana State Prison
400 Conley Lake Road
Deer Lodge, MT 59722
Phone (406) 846-1320, ext. 2453
FAX: (406) 846-2913
E-Mail: cneubauer@state.mt.us

Stan Repko
Director Office of Policy and Planning
New Jersey Department of Corrections
PO Box 863
Trenton, NJ 08625
Phone: (609) 984-4578
FAX: (609) 633-2112
E-Mail: stanley.repko@doc.state.nj.us

S. Fred Roesel
Chief Bureau of Classification and Central Records
Florida Department of Corrections
2601 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2500
Phone: (850) 410-4365
FAX: (850) 922-4178
E-Mail: roesel.fred@mail.dc.state.fl.us

James E. Thatcher
Chief of Classification and Treatment
Washington State Department of Corrections
PO Box 41108
Olympia, WA 98504-1108
Phone: (360) 753-1598
FAX: (360) 664-8754
E-Mail: jethatcher@doc1.wa.gov

D.   Biographic Sketches

James Austin, Ph.D. . . .

is the Co-Director of The Institute on Crime, Justice, and Corrections at The George Washington University. Prior to joining The Institute, he was the Executive Vice President of The National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Dr. Austin began his career in criminology as correctional sociologist for the Illinois Department of Corrections where he was employed at the Stateville and Joliet Correctional Centers. He received his bachelors degree in sociology from Wheaton College, his masters degree in sociology from DePaul University in Chicago, and his doctorate, also in sociology, from the University of California, at Davis.

Dr. Austin serves, or has recently served, as director for several large NIJ-funded research and evaluation programs, most notably: the Correctional Options Evaluation, An Experimental Test of the Oklahoma Electronic Monitoring program, Evaluation of the Los Angeles Sheriffs Department (RID) Boot Camp Program, and Evaluation of Drug Treatment Programs in Local Correctional Agencies.

Dr. Austin has authored numerous publications. His most recent book, entitled *It's About Time: America's Imprisonment Binge,* was published in 1996 (co-authored with Dr. John Irwin). In 1991 he was named the American Correctional WASPC's recipient of the Peter P. Lejin's Research Award and received the Western Society of Criminology Paul Tappan award for outstanding contributions in the field of criminology.

Dr. Austin has conducted several studies of drug treatment programs within the U.S. criminal justice and correctional systems. He is currently directing the evaluation of the Michigan Department of Corrections Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT) program. He has also provided analysis of the impacts of various sentencing systems including penalties for drug crimes. Finally, he has been a lead consultant for the NIC Jail Center Objective Jail Classification program having participated in numerous training seminars and on-site assessments.

Pamela J. Brandon. . .

is an Administrator with Wisconsin's Department of Corrections, Division of Program Planning and Movement. As Administrator of one of five major divisions within the Wisconsin Deportment of Corrections Ms. Brandon has system-wide responsibility in the following areas:

- Bureau of Offender Program Development and Evaluation Responsible for such things as the Sex Offender Registration Program, the Sexual Predator Commitment Process, program development for adults & juveniles (probationers/parolees and inmates) in the areas of AODA, Cognitive Interventions, Sex Offender Treatment, High-Risk Offenders, Domestic Violence, and evaluation of service delivery/ effectiveness/impact;

- Bureau of Offender Classification and Movement (see below);

- Office of Victim Services and Programs; and

- Electronic Monitoring Services Center.

Specifically in the area of offender classification and movement Ms. Brandon oversees the department-wide provision of these services:

- Operation of the centralized reception and assessment center for all male and female felons committed to the Wisconsin prison system. This initial intake assessment and evaluation process results in the development of an individualized plan for each offender which reflects their current custody, security, and treatment needs. This plan directs their eventual physical placement with the prison system.

- Once an offender completes the reception process he/she is then provided a regular "program review" committee hearing (PRC) (currently every six months; proposed change is to be every twelve months) that allows for the assessment of their overall, ongoing adjustment and progress. This hearing is the determining factor for their continuation at their present location or movement to another facility.

- Additionally, since we are utilizing more than 5000*in/out-of-state contract beds, this PRC process provides for offender transfer and movement, following the approval of the contract facility, to these in/out-of-state contract sites.

- Schedule actual physical movements and transfers for the entire adult system which currently includes approximately 21,000 inmates, 13 major maximum/medium facilities, 19 minimum facilities, and 15 various contract sites (in/out of state)*.

Sammie D. Brown . . .

is a Correctional Program Specialist in the National Institute of Corrections, Prisons Division in Washington, DC. She is on intergovernmental loan to NIC from the South Carolina Deportment of Corrections. In her current capacity, she manages cooperative agreements, training programs, and short-term technical assistance projects that provide assistance to numerous correctional agencies throughout the country that are evaluating, validating, and improving prison classification systems. In her recent article in Corrections Today, "Into the Millennium with Comprehensive Objective Prison Classification Systems," she summarized a number of major initiatives that she manages for NIC that provide assistance to correctional agencies to further the development of comprehensive systems. In addition, she manages a multi-agency collaborative effort in Washington State involving federal, state, and local jurisdictions planning for correctional population management; other initiatives on the development of management information systems to enhance prison classification, information technology, and integrated justice information systems; work with a number of states on classification of women offenders, and the Federal Bureau of Prisons on juvenile classification; as well as new initiatives that will concentrate on classification of high-risk offenders.

She has 33 years experience in state and federal government and began her career in the field of adult corrections in 1971. She was Director of Classification in South Carolina from 1988 to 1996 and Chief of Classification from 1985 to 1988. She directed the development and implementation of an objective classification system and an internal management classification system in South Carolina; developed a comprehensive training program for classification personnel; conducted research to develop a behavioral classification system for women offenders. She reorganized the management of inmate records and audits

of all active inmate records to improve the accuracy and completeness of the MIS, including all sentencing data; and restructured the staffing to provide better supervision of critical functions and to operate 24 hours a day, 7 days/week. Also, while in SC, she directed the Shock Incarceration and Youthful Offender Programs and implemented procedures for the programs which resulted in significant impact on bed space and saved approximately $6 million annually. She has served on numerous agency planning committees in such areas a facility design and management training in addition to special needs, long-term and women offender issues.

On the national level, prior to coming to NIC, she served as a consultant and provided technical assistance to correctional agencies on classification, unit management, and women offenders; participated as speaker, facilitator, and planner at correctional conferences; served as a faculty member and seminar planner at the National Academy of Corrections for prison classification and management modalities; served as a guest lecturer for graduate and undergraduate classes in Criminal Justice at the University of South Carolina; and testified as an expert witness in classification. She has published several articles, including "Shock Incarceration for Women in South Carolina," in Corrections Compendium (February 1994), and "Offender Classification: Don't Overlook This Important Security Strategy," in Corrections Today (July 1989). Her research has been cited in several books and publications.

Gerry Gaes, Ph. D. . . . .

received his Ph.D. in Social Psychology from the State University of New York at Albany in 1980. He joined the Bureau of Prisons in 1980 and has worked in the Office of Research from 1980 to the present with the exception of a two year period (1982, 1983) when he served as a research analyst at the Federal Correctional Institution in Otisville, New York. He also spent two years on detail at the United States Sentencing Commission from 1985 to 1987 to develop a population projection micro simulation and an expert system to apply U. S. Sentencing Guidelines.

In 1988, Dr. Gaes was appointed Chief of the Office of Research and still holds that position. He has published in professional journals and has several chapters in edited books. His most recent chapters include two on prison rehabilitation programs entitled "Adult Correctional Treatment" which appeared in the book Prisons, Crime and Justice: A Review of Research edited by Michael Tonry and Joan Petersilia and "Correctional Treatment" published in the volume The Handbook of Crime and Punishment, edited by Michael Tonry. In July 2000, Gerry received the U.S. Department of Justice Attorney General's Distinguished Service award for the correctional research he has conducted throughout his career. Gerry's current research interests include prison privatization, evaluation methodology, inmate gangs, inmate classification, simulating criminal justice processes, prison crowding, prison violence, and the effectiveness of prison program interventions on post-release outcomes.

Patricia L. Hardyman, Ph.D. . . .

is an Executive Research Director with The Institute. Previously, she was a Senior Researcher and Director of the New York City office for the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD). She received her bachelors degree in psychology and sociology from Miami University of Ohio, her masters degree in criminal justice from University of Cincinnati and her doctorate, also in criminal justice, from the Rutgers University: School of Criminal Justice.

Dr. Hardyman has extensive research experience with data base development and management, court

services, parole decision making and community supervision innovations. She served as the manager on several major projects which included, but were not limited to, design of classification systems for the Philadelphia Prison System, Wyoming, Montana (prison and community supervision), Maine (adult prison and youth training school); Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice (both external and internal classification), evaluation of drug offender treatment in local jails; and evaluation of federal correctional options programs (five states). Dr. Hardyman has worked closely with Dr. Austin on the NIC internal classification initiative in Florida, South Dakota, Oregon, New Jersey, Missouri, Colorado, Connecticut, and Washington state. Dr. Hardyman also served as the state facilitator/trainer for Rhode Island and Florida with the Comprehensive Strategy Project. Comprehensive Strategy is an Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Project in which training and technical assistance is provided to communities for developing a five-year strategic plan to prevent and reduce violent juvenile crime.

Most recently, she served as a consultant to the Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice for the development of work plans to develop and implementation of objective classification, risk assessment, and intake systems. She is currently working with the states of Kentucky, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Oklahoma, and Delaware to revalidate their objective classification systems. She serves as a consultant to Dr. Van Voorhis on NIC's current cooperative agreement to provide technical assistance to state correctional agencies in developing and implementing women's classification systems. Through the NIC cooperative agreement with The Institute, she is working with Idaho, West Virginia, and Florida to refine and validate their classification systems to effectively manage their female inmate populations.

Miles D. Harer, Ph.D. . . .

is a Section Chief for Basic Research and Evaluation with the Federal Bureau of Prison's Office of Research and Evaluation. He began his employment with the Federal Bureau of Prisons in 1987. His research has included the following: assessing the ecological predictors of violent crime across metropolitan areas; explaining crime rate trends in the United States; assessing methods for making prison population projections; assessing the individual and environmental predictors of prison violence; validating the predictive validity of recidivism risk instruments; evaluating the recidivism reducing effects of prison Boot Camps and prison education programs; evaluating incapacitation among imprisoned Federal drug offenders; and, in recent years, assessing the predictive validity of inmate classification systems.

Prior to beginning graduate work, he was employed as a Job Development Specialist by the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections at the women's facility in Muncy Pennsylvania. During his graduate work at The Pennsylvania State University, he studied demography, criminology, quantitative methods, and economics, receiving a Ph.D. in Sociology, with a Master's Equivalency in Economics.

He has published in the following scholarly journals: The American Sociological Review; The American Journal of Sociology; Social Forces; Criminology; Research in Crime and Delinquency; Federal Probation, and The Federal Sentencing Reporter. His most recent article entitled, "Similarities and Differences in Female and Male Predictors of Prison Violence: Assessing the Gender Specific Predictive Validity of a Risk Classification System," with Neal Langan (Bureau's Office of Research and Evaluation), is currently under review with the Journal of Crime and Delinquency.

William A. Harrison. . .

began his corrections career in April of 1969 as a corrections counselor at the State Correctional Institution at Camp Hill, Pennsylvania. He progressed through the ranks to Counselor Supervisor, Director of a token

economy project and Director of Treatment to which he was appointed in 1976.

In December 1984, he was appointed to the Bureau of Inmate Services where he currently serves as the Chief of Classification Services. In this position, he is responsible for the delivery of the following services:

- Inmate classification system (PACT);
- Inmate separations;
- Inmate transfers; and
- Diagnostic and classification process for males and females.

Bill holds an Associate Degree from York College of Pennsylvania, a Bachelor of Science Degree in Psychology from Windham College and a Master of Science Degree in Counseling from Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania. He undertook post-graduate studies at the University of Pennsylvania's School of Social Work and Shippensburg University. He also received continuing education credits from the National Institute of Corrections, the University of South Carolina, and other professional training institutes.

Bill holds membership in the American Correctional Association, the Pennsylvania Association of Probation, Parole and Corrections and is a Trustee of the Middle Atlantic States Correctional Association. He is actively involved in his church as well as other community service organizations.

C. Scott Hromas . . .

is the Director of Planning and Analysis at Colorado's Department of Corrections (DOC). He has held his current position for 24 years. Prior to joining the Planning and Analysis Department, Hromas was a researcher for the Office of Research and Reporting at Colorado's DOC. As the Director of Planning and Analysis Hromas has directed important projects including the female classification project and the revalidation of the classification system (including the instruments, manual, and policy). He has served as a consultant and an expert witness.

Meesim Lee. . .

is the Branch Chief for Offender Information Management at South Carolina's Department of Corrections (SC DOC). Mrs. Lee supervises the development of executive information system and research/statistics activities. During her 28-year tenure in SC DOC, she conceptualized and implemented the Department's first inmate population projection in 1979 and directed numerous refinements, including parameter expansion and new computer algorithms over the years. She provided technical and analytical support to several sentencing guidelines commissions and was the principle analyst for legislative impact analysis, prison population projections, and internal policy/program (including classification) evaluation. During her tenure with the SC DOC, Mrs. Lee has also undertaken diverse duties such as conversion the automated offender tracking system and automation of the Central Inmate Records Office.

In October, 1998, Mrs. Lee conceptualized and obtained funding from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to develop a PC-based classification policy simulation model. A practitioner researcher partnership was formed between the SC DOC and the COMPETE Center, Graduate School of Business, College of William and Mary to build the model and construct a data warehouse. During an eighteen-month project period, the partnership designed a model to simulate the interactive dynamics of prison classification

policies, sentencing structure, inmate behavior, and prison bed type requirements.

Ed Ligtenberg . . .

is the Director of Classification, Transfer and Scheduling at South Dakota's Department of Corrections (SD DOC). As the Director, he manages the inmate program scheduling, classification, and transfer systems. Mr. Ligtenberg developed and maintains the scheduling and transfer systems to interface with current and future classification systems. He also maintains classification system policies, instructional manual, and instruments. In addition, Mr. Ligtenberg trains staff on classification, maintains quality control on the classification system and relevant computer support programs.

Mr. Ligtenberg serves as approval authority for institution transfers and maintains the projected inmate bed capacity of each facility in the state. He also serves on the SD DOC Curriculum Committee that approves all programming for adult and juvenile offenders and directs the Interstate Corrections Compact for the exchange of inmates with other states.

Nick Ludwick . . .

is the Classification Director for the Michigan Department of Corrections. He is oversees the prisoner transfer/security classification process for 45,815 prisoners --1,911 females and 43,904 males. Mr. Ludwick coordinates all prisoner movement and placement within the 42 correctional facilities and 13 prison camps. As the supervisor for the Correctional Facilities Administration Classification Department, he is responsible for department-wide training and audits of the security classification process. As needed, he has participated in the opening/ closing/conversions of all institutions.

Prior to becoming the Classification Director of Michigan's Department of Corrections, Mr. Ludwick was a Department Analyst in Correctional Facilities Administration. In this position, he was responsible for reviewing transfer requests and determining prisoner placement. He was also involved in development and coordination of prisoner transports for all correctional facilities and camps.

Candyce Neubauer . . .

Candyce Neubauer is the Bureau Chief for the Classification, Offender Movement/Placement, Disciplinary, and Grievance Programs (Technical Correctional Services) for the Montana Department of Corrections (MT DOC). She has been employed by the MT DOC for 15 years and has held her current position since 1993. Prior to becoming the Bureau Chief, she was the Classification Officer at the Montana State Prison and supervised case managers. She directed the implementation of the Department's objective classification system and the development of the training components for classification and correctional officer personnel. She enjoys doing statistical research and profiling of the MT DOC prison population and her current research interest include long-term inmates.

Stan Repko . . .

is the Director of the Office of Policy and Planning at New Jersey's Department of Corrections. He has been employed by the New Jersey Department of Corrections for 29 years and has held his current position for 14 years. He is responsible for offender classification, interagency management information systems development, video-teleconferencing, planning and analysis, population projections, and records management. He has served on numerous interagency criminal justice commissions and task forces including the Police Training Commission, the Criminal Disposition Commission, the State's Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Policy Board, and many prison overcrowding commissions.

In addition to his state experience, Mr. Repko has been a consultant with the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), the National Council on Crime Delinquency (NCCD) and numerous research and educational institutions. Through these experiences, he has visited more than 40 state, federal and local correctional and criminal justice agencies throughout 25 different states. Mr. Repko has undergraduate and graduate degrees in psychology and education and has completed the NIC/Wharton School, University Pennsylvania Strategic Management in Corrections Program and is a Certified Public Manager (CPM). His work responsibilities and accomplishments in prison and jail classification include:

- Design, development and implementation of an objective classification system for NJ DOC (1995 -1996);

- Validation of the initial and reclassification instrument in the NJ DOC (1995);

- Expansion of prison objective classification system to state-sentenced offenders housed in the 21 county jails (1997);

- Expansion of the Department's objective classification system to the women's institution. (1997);

- Design, development and implementation of an objective classification system and computerized classification module in 20 of the 21 counties (1997 - 1999);

- NIC Validation of the county jail objective classification system with Dr. Tim Brennan (1997); and

- Presently developing an electronic interface between the State's County Correctional Information System and the Department's new DOCMIS computer system for the computerized collection, scoring and preliminary custody level assignment for objective classification purposes (1999 - 2000).

Fred Roesel . . .

is the Chief of the Bureau of Classification and Central Records for the Florida Department of Corrections. His bureau is responsible for inmate reception, institutional classification, inmate release, inmate records, security threat group intelligence, Central Visitation Authority and the State Classification Office.

Mr. Roesel joined the Department of Corrections in 1977, and has both security and classification experience. His experience and vast knowledge of inmate classification resulted in is promotion to Bureau Chief in 1997.

Mr. Roesel has led and remained focused on the effort to advance and improve the agency's utilization of technology in inmate management. His efforts have resulted in the automation and improvement of classification processes in order to meet the challenges facing a department that has grown from 46,000 inmates when he started in Classification Services to approximately 71,000 inmates today.

Among the major technology applications developed under his leadership are:

- Computer Assisted Reception Process for their five reception centers;
- Automated Gain Time System;
- Integrated Assessment and Placement System;
- Automated Discipline System;
- Risk and Needs Internal Classification System;
- Custody Assessment and Reclassification System;
- Security Threat Operational Review and Management System;

Awards and accomplishments:

- Secretary's Distinguished Achievement Award in 1993;
- Employee of the year for the Department of Corrections in 1994; and
- Davis Productivity Award (private sector award for government productivity) in 1993, 1994, three in 1996, 1997, two in 1998 and another in 1999.

Recently, Mr. Roesel guided his section through an agency reorganization that greatly increased the duties, responsibilities, and personnel of the Bureau of Classification and Central Records.

Larry B. Solomon. . .

is the Deputy Director at the National Institute of Corrections. He has held his current position since 1982. He holds a BA in Criminology from the University of Maryland and a MSW from Howard University. Previously, he has served as Chief of the Community Corrections Division at NIC; a senior program analyst at the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration; Deputy Commissioner for Classification and Treatment for the Massachusetts Department of Corrections; Social Service Coordinator for the DC Department of Corrections, and held numerous other social service positions. He is a lecturer at the University of Maryland and has published numerous articles including "Developing An Empirically Based Model for Classification Decision Making," Effective Strategies for Implementing a Comprehensive Classification System,"Classification: Past Failures, Future Potential," and "The Role of Rehabilitation and Programs in Prisons."

James E. Thatcher . . .

is the Chief of Classification and Treatment in the Office of Correctional Operations at Washington State Department of Corrections. Mr. Thatcher manages departmental inmate diagnostic and classification processes, inmate movement, and facility assignments. He provides direction, project management, and assistance in the planning and preparation of policy/procedural directives related to offender classification/case management, records, and transportation. He also assists in the preparation, implementation, response to legislative inquiries.